



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

causes of this phenomenon, the remarks of PAUL, 'Principien,' p. 60, on the subject of all so-called metathesis in general, would apply in the present case of reciprocal metathesis. It is well recognized that special difficulties arise when it is a question of pronouncing correctly in rapid succession similar and also dissimilar sounds. On this point, PAUL, as quoted, brings forward the expression: *Der kutscher putzt den postkutschkasten*. Certain errors or slips in speaking are favored by certain predisposing conditions. These conditions appear repeatedly in different persons. Modes of speaking which are thus at first judged incorrect, may, at the hands of the next generation, come to be considered normal. Such processes establish themselves most easily in case of learned or foreign words, which contain successions of sounds not familiar to the native idiom. In these cases a certain vague or inaccurate perception and an imperfect "Einprägung" of the word, enter in as elements of influence. Likewise in many cases the element of popular etymology must be considered. While the phonetic nearness of sounds to each other is a predisposing cause to the play of reciprocal metathesis, the phonetic character of the word as a whole also conditions to a certain extent the change. A succession of like vowel sounds favors an interchange of preceding or following consonantal sounds.

The body of the present brochure is a collection of examples, drawn from the various departments of the Romance group, which the author presents as a contribution of additional material on the subject in question. The bulk of his work concerns the metathesis of consonants. He treats first those words in which the consonants (not immediately following each other) which interchange their positions are either (a) followed by similar vowels, as French *philosophe* (in the Parisian popular speech) instead of *philosopher*, or (b) are preceded by similar vowels, as Sicil. *padalinu*=PALATINUS. A relatively large number of words fall under these two classes, and prove that the proximity of similar vocalic elements is especially favorable to an interchange of consonantal elements.

DR. BEHRENS next discusses cases in

which the consonants undergoing reciprocal metathesis are preceded or followed by dissimilar vowels. Here interchange of liquids is frequent, as Old French *calorent* ('Chev. as deus esp.' 9761) instead of *carolent*; or metathesis of other consonants of like type or class, as Port. *fedito* (folk speech)=*fetido* (CORNU), or Span. *retosar*, Port. *retouçar*=*resaltare* (CORNU).

A dozen pages are devoted to some cases of reciprocal metathesis between vowels not immediately related; so old Sard. *ruclat*=*RECLAT*: *ruchelat*: *ruclat*, French *lamichon* (Lille) by the side of *limachon*. Examples under this division are comparatively few and drawn largely from the dialects.

Reciprocal metathesis is not confined to the younger phases of Romance Language development, but is met as well in the older monuments. Not seldom also the same individual changes are seen in several of the Romance idioms, usually however without our being able to draw any conclusion regarding the age of such forms. No particular language territory is favored above others, the phenomenon in question being in the main equally distributed over the whole field.

B. L. BOWEN.

*Bowdoin College*

*Der Satzbau des althochdeutschen Isidor im Verhältniss zur lateinischen Vorlage. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Syntax von MAX RANOW. [Zweites Heft der Schriften zur germanischen Philologie herausgegeben von DR. MAX ROEDIGER]. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1888.*

Our study of the German sentence in the initial stages of its development as a vehicle of literary expression is beset by the same difficulty that confronts us in the case of so many other languages, the difficulty, namely, that the earliest extant documents offer us next to nothing in the way of unconstrained prose. Investigation has to be based almost entirely upon poetry and translations. As to which of these two might be expected to reflect the more accurately the facts of every-day syntax there is perhaps room for discussion. The general opinion seems to be that poetry distorts the more. I do not precisely wish to put

forward a dissentient opinion, and I grant that RANNO's remark concerning the risk of basing our views of O. H. G. syntax too exclusively upon OTFRID is quite in place; for OTFRID was a poet, and was doubtless occasionally conscious of doing more or less violence to his native tongue. Still I cannot help regarding it as an open question whether the manifold constraints of a Latin original might not here and there carry an O. H. G. translator even further from the normal syntax of his people than a facile versifier would be carried by the exigencies of assonance and poetic diction.

But apart from this question it is certainly desirable to know accurately how the different O. H. G. translators of the eighth and ninth centuries compare with one another in fidelity to their originals and in apparent command of the idiomatic resources of German. Hence the usefulness of DR. RANNO's study. Some writers, for example GERING and DENECKE, have held that the O. H. G. 'Ammonius' (or Tatian) is a better criterion for syntactical purposes than the 'Isidore,' in which the Latin original seems, at first view, to be treated with excessive and even careless freedom. RANNO has accordingly gone to work to test the credentials of the translator of ISIDORE by making a minute comparison of his work with the Latin original. The study is divided into three parts, the first dealing with the rendering of independent, the second with that of dependent sentences. Here the object of the inquiry is to ascertain how far the translator has deviated from the syntactical form of his original and to explain his deviations if possible. The results obtained are presented in statistical form and indicate, in a general way, a preference on the part of the German for hypotactic constructions. The third part is devoted to those Latin constructions that presented peculiar difficulties, the accusative with the infinitive, the ablative absolute, the gerund, etc. Interesting among the matters here touched is the moot question of the character of the German dative absolute. This is employed once as a translation of the Latin *moriens*; *utique quia moriens caro ejus non vidit corruptionem* is rendered *so chinuissō ist dhazs imu arsterbandemu siin fleisc ni chisah enigan unnuuillun*. Three times it occurs as a trans-

lation of the ablative absolute: *dicente eodem filio* appears as *selbemu gotes sune quhedhen-demu*; and *omnibus vitiorum generibus expul-sis vel angelorum malorum hostibus effugatis* as *allem sundono chunnum ardrībendēm ioh allem herum ubilero angilo arflaugidam*. But now, as there are fifteen ablatives absolute in the text reported on by RANNO, it looks as if the O. H. G. dative absolute were felt by the translator to be an un-German construction which he would allow himself to use only under constraint. This view is confirmed when we find so simple and natural a phrase as *patre suo vivente* rendered by *bi sinemu fatere lebendemu* where the *bi* would hardly have crept in if the simple dative absolute had been felt as perfectly German.

The general conclusion reached by RANNO is that the O. H. G. translator of ISIDORE worked conscientiously and intelligently; that as a rule he endeavored to reproduce the syntactical forms of his original by corresponding German forms wherever this was possible; that, however, he often deviated from the Latin construction or type of sentence, and occasionally added a word or a clause of his own; his object being in such cases either to make the meaning clearer or to adapt the thought more perfectly to the idiomatic proprieties of his own tongue.

CALVIN THOMAS.

University of Michigan.

*Études lexicographiques sur l'ancienne langue française* à propos du dictionnaire de M. GODEFROY par le DR. A. MILLET, Paris. 1888. pp. 69

This is a systematic and exhaustive review of GODEFROY's dictionary. All the faults of omission and commission of this extremely unwieldy and defective work are exposed with painstaking precision. GODEFROY has encumbered his dictionary of Old French with a great many Middle French words coined by RABELAIS and his contemporaries; he has often heaped up examples of the same meaning of the same word, and, on the other hand, utterly failed to give examples for other words; he intends to leave out all Old French words which still exist with the same meaning in the modern language—a fatal mistake—and he repeatedly